

## **REMARKS**

In the first Office Action on the merits of April 23, 2007 in the subject U.S. patent application, claims 90-110, 117, 118 and 124-133 were withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. In response, these claims have now been cancelled. Applicant again expressly reserves the right to file one or more divisional patent applications directed to these claims.

Various ones of the claims pending in the application were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 4,635,550 to Brands, whether by itself or taken in combination with one of the relied on secondary references to Heinemann, U.S. patent No. 4,452,193, to Kobler, U.S. patent No. 5,351,615 or to Weber, U.S. patent No. 5,090,319. Claims 85, 88 and 89 were objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. These claims were indicated as being allowable, if presented in independent form.

In response, claim 70 has been amended to include the language of indicated allowable claim 85, which claim has now been cancelled. Claim 88 has been presented in independent form by the inclusion in it of the language of independent claim 70 from which it depended. It is believed that claims 70 and 88 are now allowable. Indicated allowable claim 89 depends from now independent claim 88 and is also believed to be allowable. All of the other claims now pending in the subject application depend from either believed allowable independent claim 70 or believed allowable independent claim 88 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

Minor errors in claims 71, 73, 75 and 120 have been corrected. These changes do not affect the scope of the claims but instead merely provide uniformity of

terminology and proper antecedent basis.

The addition of independent claim 88 does not require the payment of any additional claims fee. The cancellation of the various claims not selected for prosecution reduces both the overall number of claims pending and the number of independent claims pending.

The prior art cited and relied on in the rejections of various ones of the claims have been noted. Since indicated allowable claims 85 and 88 have been put in independent form, no further comment on that prior art is believed to be required.

## SUMMARY

Indicated allowable claims 85 and 88 have both been put in independent form. The claims not selected for prosecution in this application have been cancelled. All of the claims now pending in the subject application are believed to be patentable over the prior art cited and relied on. Allowance of the claims, and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas KÜMMET  
Applicant

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas R. Hanscom  
Reg. No. 26, 600

May 17, 2007  
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 415-1500  
Attorney Docket: W1.2247 PCT-US